DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 431 366 HE 032 154

AUTHOR	Parsons, Beverly A.
TITLE	Questions Raised by Contrasting School-University Partnerships with Community-University Partnerships.
INSTITUTION	InSites, Boulder, CO.
PUB DATE	1999-04-00
NOTE	22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Ontario, Canada, April 19-23, 1999).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College School Cooperation; Community Development; Cooperative Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Inservice Education; Partnerships in Education; Professional Education; *School Community Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Colorado

ABSTRACT

This paper contrasts two types of university partnerships: first, the Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal (CoPER), between six higher education institutions and 12 school districts in Colorado; and, second, 10 separate community-university partnerships (CUP). Each CUP was based on an asset (as opposed to a deficit) model and developed and used various strategies classified as either: (1) professional (upgrading job-specific skills of human service professionals); (2) community (increasing the capacity of community residents to address their own needs); or (3) community-professional collaboration (re-educating human services professionals in community-oriented practices while concurrently empowering community residents to advocate for themselves). In contrast, the CoPER programs implemented only the professional strategy. Analysis of each of the three strategies in terms of participants and educational content is provided. The paper suggests that CoPER programs could extend their work by incorporating the perspectives of the community and community-professional collaboration strategies. An appendix briefly describes some examples of community-university partnership work. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

QUESTIONS RAISED BY CONTRASTING SCHOOL-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS WITH COMMUNITY-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS

ED 431 366

Beverly A. Parsons
InSites
Boulder, CO

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY:

BEVERLY A. PARSONS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

April 1999

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Parsons is Executive Director of InSites, 1460 Quince Avenue, Suite 101, Boulder, CO 80304-1157, 303-449-1190. InSites is a Colorado-based non-profit 501(c)3 organization that conducts research and evaluation and provides technical assistance to educational and social institutions/agencies and policymakers engaged in major change within their social systems. *This paper was presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting in Montreal, Canada in April 1999 as part of a symposium entitled "University/School District Partnerships from Multiple Perspectives: A Statewide View." The symposium presented the work of the team evaluating the Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal. Along with Parsons, other members of the team are Ann Foster, Elizabeth Kozleski, and Cori Mantle-Bromley. From year to year, different graduate students assisted in the work of the team.*

HE 032 154

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract
Questions Raised By Contrasting School-University Partnerships with Community-University Partnerships[1]

Beverly A. Parsons
InSites, Boulder, CO

The Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal (CoPER) includes 12 districts and six higher education institutions that collaborate to establish partner schools. CoPER, established in 1986, is a member of the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) founded by John I. Goodlad. The partner schools are designed to accomplish four functions: exemplary (excellent and equitable) education for all students, teacher preparation, continued professional development for school and university faculty, and inquiry into teaching and learning.

This paper contrasts features of CoPER with findings from an evaluation of ten community-university partnerships unrelated to CoPER and its national network. The purpose of the contrast is to provide another way to look at certain findings of the CoPER evaluation. In addition to the many positive features of CoPER, the evaluation found that: parents did not feel particularly involved in their children's education; high school students would like to be more involved in giving feedback to teacher candidates about how to be better teachers; the CoPER benchmarks did not include parents or community members; and participants felt they had not yet achieved their desired level of excellence and equity of education for all students.

The community-university partnership (CUP) initiative were funded for three years by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation (WKKF) to learn what it looks like when specific values drive social service actions in a community.[2] Somewhat like CoPER, a key feature of the initiative was that this change in orientation was to be brought about through preservice, inservice, and other education. Again, somewhat like CoPER, each partnership had a steering committee made up of representatives of each partner.

All CUP sites featured a partnership between one or more institutions of higher education and agencies and/or residents of one or more communities. Thus, like CoPER the partnership involved higher education. While each site identified its own goals specific to local needs, all focused on education and learning, and operated within the goal statements and defining values provided by the WKKF. The defining values were referred to as the "asset" (as opposed to deficit) model. Among the features of the philosophical model is a focus on the capacities and assets (rather than the deficits) of families and neighborhoods.

---

1 This paper was presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting in Montreal, Canada in April 1999 as part of a symposium entitled "University/School District Partnerships from Multiple Perspectives: A Statewide View." The symposium presented the work of the team evaluating the Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal. Along with Parsons, other members of the team are Ann Foster, Elizabeth Kozleski, and Cori Mantle-Bromley. From year to year, different graduate students assisted in the work of the team.

2 InSites—an educational and social system research and evaluation firm—conducted a cluster evaluation of the partnerships. For more details about the evaluation and the CUP initiative, see Parsons B. and Z. Hammond-Hanson (1998) Partnerships: A Powerful Tool for Improving the Well-Being of Families and Neighborhoods. Boulder, CO: InSites.

Each community-university partnership developed and used a strategy to educate partnership participants in the asset model. The strategies varied in educational content, primary participants, and how the learning experiences were conducted. Educational strategies clustered around three primary orientations:

1. **The Professional Strategy:** Upgrading job specific skills of *professionals* and/or introducing them to practices based on the asset paradigm.
2. **The Community Strategy:** Increasing the capacity among *community residents* to address their own needs and to advocate for themselves within the social service system.
3. **The Community-Professional Collaboration Strategy:** Re-educating *professionals* in community oriented practices while *concurrently* empowering *community residents* to advocate for themselves and solve their community problems.

Strategy	Partners	Target Group	Content
Professional Strategy	· universities · agencies	· front-line workers · administrators · (university faculty)	· professional skills · efficiency · efficacy · community-based practices
Community Strategy	· residents/associations	(university faculty)	problems · community development, advocacy
Community/ Professional Collaboration Strategy	· universities · agencies · residents/associations	· Front-line workers · (administrators) · residents/associations · (university faculty)	· (P) understand role in community · community-based practices · solve real life problems jointly · community development

Figure 1. Contrasts in Strategies

Figure 1 summarizes key differences among the strategies. CoPER falls into the professional strategy. The question this analysis raises is whether CoPER should involve the community more fully in the renewal of the education system preschool through higher education. Doing so could well mean a shift to include community members on the governing board and in education experiences. The content of the education experiences may also change. The key question is whether such a shift would enhance the four functions of partner schools.

A copy of the full paper can be obtained at www.InSites.org.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

This presentation is part an interactive symposium entitled "University/School District Partnerships from Multiple Perspectives: A Statewide View." Other papers presented the design and findings from the multi-year evaluation of the Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal (CoPER). The evaluation is designed to explore the educational renewal agenda of CoPER and provide information that CoPER can use to improve its work.

CoPER includes 12 districts and six higher education institutions that have collaborated to establish partner schools across Colorado. CoPER has been in existence since 1986 and is a member of the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) founded by John I. Goodlad. NNER is a national organization of schools and colleges/universities whose participants strive to simultaneously improve schools and the preparation of new teachers working toward conditions outlined in Goodlad's book, Educational Renewal (1994). Much of the work of educational renewal occurs at the partner school sites, where pre-service teachers learn from and with practicing teachers, and where the university faculty and students become a part of the learning culture at the school site. The partner schools are designed to accomplish four functions: exemplary (excellent and equitable) education for all students, teacher preparation, continued professional development for school and university faculty, and inquiry into teaching and learning.

CoPER is guided by a governing board composed of university deans and district superintendents. A coordinating committee made up of university faculty members and district and school administrators guides the implementation of the partner school and other CoPER work. (For further description of CoPER, see other papers from the symposium.)

The evaluation team began its work nearly three years ago by discussing a variety of evaluation methods and philosophies that it might use. This presentation is included in this symposium as a way to get reactions from the discussants and audience about how far an evaluation team should go in raising questions about the basic premises of the endeavor being evaluated. Should the evaluation team stay within the paradigm and boundaries of the partnership's philosophy? How far should it go beyond the data collected in the immediate setting?

This paper draws on findings from an evaluation of a group of community-university partnerships unrelated to CoPER and its national network. The purpose of the contrast is to provide further information and topics for discussion with CoPER, stimulated by the findings of the CoPER evaluation that parents felt they were not sufficiently involved in their children's education, high school students said they would like to be more involved in giving feedback to teacher candidates about how they could be better teachers, the CoPER benchmarks did not include parents or community members, and participants felt that they had not yet achieved the level of excellence and equity of education for all students that they desire.

The paper begins with a description of the community-university partnerships and how they compare to the CoPER. It is followed by a description of three strategies for designing partnerships and educating their members. Who is involved and affected by the strategies and difference in the content of educational experiences is also provided. The paper ends by posing questions that the comparison raises for CoPER.

Descriptions of Partnerships

The community-university partnership (CUP) initiative were funded for three years by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation (WKKF) to learn what it looks like when specific values drive social service actions in a community[3]. A key feature of the initiative was that this change in orientation was to be brought about through pre-service and in-service education and other education operated under the auspices of community-university partnerships. Each partnership had a steering committee made up of representatives of each partner.

Since the CUP initiative was exploratory, the partnerships were given considerable freedom in designing their partnerships and the way they would undertake educational endeavors. In some cases the partnerships were in existence before the WFFK funding and in other cases partnerships were newly formed. This situation bears similarities to the CoPER situation in that CoPER partner schools represent a wide variety of pre-existing relationships between the schools and higher education institutions.

All sites featured a partnership between one or more institutions of higher education and agencies and/or residents of one or more communities. While each site identified its own goals specific to local needs, all focused on education and learning, and operated within the goal statements and defining values provided by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. The defining values were referred to as the "asset" (as opposed to deficit) model. The philosophical model included the following features:

- a focus on the capacities and assets (rather than the deficits) of families and neighborhoods
- seeking to build self-determination and responsibility among families and address the collective set of problems they are facing (rather than working primarily with individuals or with only one problem)
- looking at families in the context of their community
- actively engaging community residents in change
- focusing on results rather than following the rules
- incorporating a multicultural and cross-cultural perspective into services
- reducing top-down approaches and encouraging bottom-up change

The partnerships were taking the approach that social service agencies and social workers would be most effective if they focused on the assets of a community rather than its deficits. The deficit orientation currently dominates the field.

The partnerships were located in Bay Mills, MI; Berkeley, CA with New Mexico; the Chelsea and Dudley communities near Boston, MA; Chicago, IL; Cleveland, OH; Kalamazoo, MI; Long Beach, CA; Miami, FL; Pittsburgh, PA; and the Upper Cumberland region of Tennessee.

---

[3] InSites—an educational and social system research and evaluation firm—conducted a cluster evaluation of the partnerships. For more details about the evaluation and the CUP initiative, see Parsons B. and Z. Hammond-Hanson (1998) *Partnerships: A Powerful Tool for Improving the Well-Being of Families and Neighborhoods*. Boulder, CO: InSites.

The communities typically faced severe social and economic-related crises and tended to include largely minority populations based on race, age, and/or socioeconomic situation. Distinctive cultural values exist within the communities involved and historical power issues were a major factor for partnerships.

Many participants developed an awareness of what a resident-centered model of community participation and problem-solving would look like. They learned about one another's cultural strengths and styles. They discovered new models for service delivery and were given the language to clarify what it meant to be professionally competent. As parties from different perspectives (university, resident, and agency) came together, the boundary crossings sparked new ideas, hopes, and possibilities for revitalizing true community. When they joined their skills, knowledge, resources, and commitments, things began to happen that never could have taken place within their separate sectors.

Participants repeatedly reported that it was this personal, energizing empowerment that was at the core of what was accomplished by the partnerships. And this is likely to be the force that encourages the continuation of new learning and growth opportunities beyond the three years of the grant. Each partnership was powerful and effective in accomplishing positive change, often beyond anyone's expectations. Appendix A provides examples of the work of each partnership.

Although the partnerships had many struggles and some disbanded at the end of the three years, the work of the partnerships made important impacts upon colleges, universities, and their students; agencies; community residents; and the individuals who participated in the partnerships and educational programs.

The partnerships impacted academic institutions and their students in several ways. They improved pre-service curriculum by creating over 25 new courses and 36 revised courses. Some partnerships started new social work tracks and others built new academic career ladders and degree programs. Pre-service students gained an understanding of community-based service delivery and the link between community circumstances and families' lives. Faculty members developed new understanding and theories about the changing context in communities and its impact on residents' behavior and beliefs.

Agency in-service participants developed a better understanding of the community dynamics and factors that affect family well-being. Partnerships were especially successful in providing in-service education to small community-based agencies and churches and in promoting practices that value collaboration, cooperation, and empowering methods in professional development. However, in spite of solid achievements, agencies did not significantly change service delivery systems from their current fragmented state.

Residents gained a new sense of empowerment and control over their environment and future by developing advocacy skills, identifying their assets, and building professional and life skills. The partnerships helped residents explore political and economic development in their communities and identify additional community institutions to help bring about change.

Participation in a partnership was a major capacity-building experience for those who experienced the process. They developed greater awareness of factors impacting families and communities. They learned to think creatively about how to achieve family and community well-

being. Above all, partnerships fostered respectful, asset-based relationships among partnership members and, to some extent, their institutions and other groups.

Thus these partnerships are similar to the Colorado Partnership in that they are focused on pre-service and in-service education. They include universities in partnership with another entity. They seek to bring about change in basic values of the social systems involved. (The community-university partnerships are addressing the shift from the deficit to the asset model while educators in CoPER are moving from a selecting and sorting education system to one that provides high quality education for all students.) Their fundamental difference is in the entities working in partnership with the university. This difference raises questions that may or may not be relevant to CoPER and may or may not be appropriate for the evaluators to raise.

Selecting and Implementing a Learning Strategy

Each community-university partnership developed and used a strategy to educate partnership participants in the asset model. The partnerships eventually expanded into four kinds of education: pre-service education, fellowships, in-service education, and/or community education.

They varied in educational content, primary participants, and how the learning experiences were conducted. As the evaluators looked across the educational approaches, makeup, and philosophy of all the partnerships, an interesting pattern began to emerge. While each site's goals for improving the well-being of families and neighborhoods were unique, educational strategies clustered around three primary orientations:[4]

1. **The Professional Strategy:** Upgrading job specific skills of *human service professionals* and/or introducing them to practices based on the asset paradigm.

2. **The Community Strategy:** Increasing the capacity among *community residents* to address their own needs and to advocate for themselves within the social service system.

3. **The Community-Professional Collaboration Strategy:** Re-educating human *services professionals* in community oriented practices while *concurrently* empowering *community residents* to advocate for themselves and solve their community problems.

Despite the particular strategy used, all partnerships used their strategy for the same purpose—to move away from the hierarchical, bureaucratic model of human service delivery and

---

[4] The primary sources used to develop this theme were:

McKnight, J. (1995) *The Careless Society: Community and Its Counterfeits*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

McKnight, J and J. Kretzmann (1993) *Building Communities from the Inside Out: A Path Toward Finding and Mobilizing a Community's Assets*. Evanston, IL: Center for Urban Affairs on Policy Research, Neighborhood Innovations Network, Northwestern University.

Parsons, B.A. (1998) "*Using a Systems Change Approach to Building Communities*", in The Policymakers' Program: The First Five Years, Volume II: Implementation Tools. St. Louis, MO: Danforth Foundation.

Pierce, C., et al. (1986) *A Male/Female Continuum*. Laconia, NH: New Dynamics Publications.

Lipnack, J. and J. Stamps (1993) *The TeamNet Factor*. Essex Junction, VT: Olivie Wight Publications.

Anderson (Parsons), B.L. (1993) *Framework for Understanding and Assessing Systemic Change*. Ft. Collins, CO: InSites.

Anderson (Parsons), B.L. (1993) *"The Stages of Systemic Change."* Educational Leadership. *September 1993, 14-17.*

toward the asset model—in order to more effectively improve conditions for families and neighborhoods.

About halfway through the grant period, the evaluators found that four sites (Chicago, Bay Mills, Tennessee, and Miami) were aligned primarily with the professional strategy. Four sites (Long Beach, Cleveland, Chelsea/Dudley, and Pittsburgh) were aligned with the community-professional collaboration strategy. Two sites (Berkeley/New Mexico and Kalamazoo) were aligned with the community strategy (see Figure 1).

Figure 1 – Alignment (Based on Contextual Factors) of Sites with Strategies

Sites were not necessarily aligning themselves consciously with a particular strategy. Instead, these strategies represent patterns the evaluators saw emerging across the cluster. The evaluators found that any of the three strategies can be used to implement the asset model; the one selected depended on contextual factors in the situation. Also, the alignment of a given site with a particular strategy was representative of a point in time in the life of the partnership, not necessarily indicative of a permanent condition or orientation.

For example, the partnership in Kalamazoo was originally aligned with the professional strategy to impact change in their social service system. The Community Training Associations (CTAs) were designed to develop training modules for agency staff personnel as part of in-service education. Yet, mid-way through the development of the CTAs, it became clear that residents and communities were being more fully impacted. The professional strategy shifted to a community strategy that focused almost exclusively on building the capacity of the community. It may well be that this emphasis will shift to the professional strategy after a period of time and ultimately to a community-professional collaboration strategy.

Before looking at the implications of these findings for who is in the partnership, who is the target audience for learning experiences and what the content of the experiences is, consider a further description of the three strategies.

The Professional Strategy

When a site used a professional strategy, their work was implicitly or explicitly built on the assumption that the asset model can be, and needs to be, embedded in social service systems by

changing the knowledge base and practices of social service professionals. This approach is tied to the fact that specialized education is a key definer of professional work. Professional institutions surrender considerable control over their choice of workers and ways of performing work to universities and others that prepare and certify the professionals. This is done because professional practices are expected to increase the quality of the services that are provided since professionals possess specialized knowledge and skills to deal with particular problems at the community level.

Professionals are also important in shaping public perception of what is appropriate practice because their knowledge and skills are legitimized with credentials and licensing. Additionally, in their professional capacity, professionals are given the power to define the problem, to create and implement the solution/treatment, and to evaluate its efficacy. Thus it is very important to have professionals who have an appropriate understanding of the families and communities they serve.

In CUP sites where education experiences focused on professionals, it centered around helping professionals and their organizations move away from a hierarchical, bureaucratic system through the teaching of new asset-oriented paradigms and increasing the quality and professionalism of workers who lacked advanced skills. Priorities tended to center on pre-service and in-service education rather than community education.

The design of CoPER fits the professional strategy.

The Community (Resident-based) Strategy

One of the criticisms of the professional strategy is that the "professionalism" it promotes can work to the detriment of society. The assumption is that professional dominance exerts negative effects upon the problem-solving capacities of the primary social structures of society: family, neighborhood, church/synagogue, and ethnic group. The ultimate tragedy here is that, in its extreme, the professional approach can create a cycle of dependence and impotence that may give rise to other social and economic problems for which further professional treatment only creates deeper dependence. In the education world, this is comparable to where parents feel they are not capable of educating their children and education has become the special purview of the school.

When professional services define "need" as deficiency within individuals and communities, in order to justify the continuation of a professional services economy, human service tools themselves can reduce people's sense of self-worth, continue poverty, and create a feeling of disempowerment. Often, service providers drive system changes, and community residents are viewed as beneficiaries of services or as clients rather than the ones who are key to improving the quality of life in the community. A community-building orientation is about increasing the capacities of individuals as well as neighborhoods to create systems which work with them, not at them or for them. Eventually, through these individuals and groups, accountability develops, as does a method for the community to work to regenerate itself.

The community strategy, in contrast to the professional strategy, emphasizes empowerment and expanded capacities among community members. Residents involved in the community approach become active participants in decision making. For example, under this strategy, families and communities would define their needs, and social service professionals would work in supportive roles to help them accomplish their goals and use their assets—even if the professional disagreed

with the families' or communities' identification of needs. This strategy emphasizes interconnectedness as well as meaningful and productive work for community residents.

The community strategy is centered on providing residents with new skills to empower them to solve their own community problems and to demand better services from the social service system. The community capacity building strategy is focused on the bottom-up feature central to the asset model. It tended to be used in places where residents felt that professionalism had moved to a detrimental extreme. That is, professionalism had dis-empowered community residents.

On the whole, social services institutions (including education) typically do not look to the community until they need to gain support for *their* (the institution's) strategies. To achieve community-based systems renewal, fundamental changes happen and are driven at the community level. To keep the focus at the community level, broader levels of the system support changes desired by the community, lending expertise and perspective in the process, rather than determining what they think is best for the community.

The notion of resident-initiated capacity-building is illustrated in the story[5] of a community on Chicago's west side:

> *This community of 60,000 people was largely both poor and African American, the majority dependent on welfare payments. Residents had formed a voluntary community organization that encompassed an area in which there were two hospitals. These hospitals had not been accessible to the black residents in this neighborhood.*
>
> *The community organization began a political struggle to "capture" the two hospitals. They were successful in convincing the board of directors of the hospitals to accept more neighborhood people as patients and employ more community residents on their staffs. After several years, the community organization stepped back and took an assessment of the health status of the community. They found that although they had "captured" the hospitals, there was no significant evidence that the health of the people had changed since they had gained control of the medical facilities in their neighborhood.*
>
> *After close examination of the hospitals' medical records to see what the most common ailments were, they were surprised to learn that the top reasons for seeking medical treatment in the community had little to do with disease. They included car accidents, interpersonal attacks, bronchial ailments, dog bites and drug/alcohol related problems. "Disease" was not the main problem that the hospitals were addressing. Instead the hospitals were dealing with maladies related to social problems. The residents within the community organization recognized that social problems were in the domain of citizens and their community organizations. The hospitals were only treating the symptoms.*
>
> *As a group of concerned citizens, the residents in the organization took this information and used it to get to the root causes of these problems and develop a strategy for addressing them in their communities. To deal with the number one cause for residents to seek medical treatment—car accidents—residents took a closer look at their neighborhood to determine where these accidents were happening and why. With help*

---

[5] This story is from McKnight, J. (1995).

from an outside city planning group that provided detailed data of traffic patterns in the neighborhood, they were able to determine that most of them occurred at the entrance to a parking lot for a department store. The group was then able to petition the store owner for some changes. This greatly reduced the number of accidents and the number of people in the neighborhood seeking medical treatment for resulting injuries.

In dealing with another primary reason residents sought medical treatment, bronchial problems, residents learned that good nutrition was a factor. They concluded that they did not have enough fresh fruit and vegetables for good nutrition. In the city particularly in the winter, these foods were too expensive. So they sought solutions to this dilemma. They asked themselves if they had the capacity to grow fresh fruit and vegetables themselves. They looked around, but it seemed difficult in the heart of Chicago to find space for gardening. Several people pointed out that most of their houses were two-story apartments with flat roofs. So they built a greenhouse on one of the roofs as an experiment. The greenhouse was seen as a tool people could make and use to gain control of their own health. But quickly people began to see that it was also an economic development tool. It increased their income because they now produced a commodity to use and sell.

Then there appeared another use for the greenhouse, one that maximized the capacities of the community. The greenhouses were now trapping lost heat and turning it into an asset. It became an energy conservation tool. The community organization that spearheaded the project also owned a retirement home for elderly members of the community. The residents of the retirement home took an interest in caring for the plants on a daily basis. They became excited and rejuvenated. They were able to use some knowledge that they had learned as children and young adults in rural areas. The greenhouse became a tool to empower older people in the community.

If we apply this model to education, it would mean a radical shift in the relationship of students, parents, and other community residents to education professionals. It may seem so radical to some educators that they can not conceive how it could be done. Yet, forms of it are occurring through home schooling and charter schools.

The Community-Professional Collaboration Strategy

The third strategy is a blending of the previous two. The community-professional collaboration strategy brings together professionals and community in a joint and concurrent effort to rebuild communities and to strengthen families, weaving in certain threads of bureaucracy or hierarchy to help provide a dependable but flexible skeleton/structure. Educational activities revolve around cross-fertilization of the best practices of residents and professionals. Community members are encouraged to move into the professional realm as a result of training that expands their capacity to advocate for their own needs, and professionals are encouraged to move into community settings as a result of new community-based skills and practices. Pre-service, in-service, and community education is focused on enhancing each person's ability to enter the other realm.

Overcoming the inherent tension between communities and institutions is key. The associations (e.g., neighborhood associations, ethnic groups, churches, clubs) of the community represent unique social tools for joining the community with managed institutions (e.g., social service agencies and schools). For example, the structure of institutions is necessarily a design

established to create control of people. On the other hand, the less formal structure of community associations is the result of people acting through consent.

Educational events within the community-professional collaboration strategy educate professionals about community-based, family-centered practices while simultaneously empowering residents to act as equal partners with professionals in improving conditions for families and communities.

CoPER and the Three Strategies

Using the definitions above, CoPER falls into the professional strategy. The question this analysis raises is whether CoPER should shift or extend its focus on simultaneous renewal to include the simultaneous renewal of the community and/or to involve the community more fully in the renewal of the education system preschool through higher education. This represents a major philosophical shift with practical implications.

To further inform this question, consider information from the CUP initiative about who is involved in each strategy and how the content of the learning experiences differ by strategy.

Strategy Participants

Three topics about who was involved in the CUP strategies is relevant—who the partners were, who was involved in educational experiences, and how information was gathered from community members.

Partners

The CUP work revealed that the official partners in the professional strategy were universities and agencies with few, if any, community members as active partners. Those using the community strategy tended to have no agency partners. Those using the community-professional collaboration strategy had a fairly balanced involvement of universities, agencies, and community residents. Representatives of the partners in each case served as the governing body.

The governing structure of CoPER is consistent with the professional strategy since it includes universities and schools and/or districts (which would be comparable to agencies in the CUP initiative).

Target Audience

Governance and partner membership is one form of involvement. Another is who the target audience is for the educational experiences. The target audience for educational experiences was noticeably different among the three strategies used in the CUP initiative.

The Professional Strategy

In the CUP initiative, the target audience for the professional strategy includes professionals working in human services with different professionals targeted, for different reasons, across the four partnerships using this strategy. For example, the Chicago Youth Agency Partnership targeted unlicensed, uncertified youth workers in an attempt to make the field of youth work more professional. Upper Cumberland's Training Resource Center (TRC) focused on training

child care workers to raise the quality of child care. Miami targeted community college faculty and students to better prepare future human service workers. They also targeted staff working in family court, volunteers operating as child advocates within the judicial system, and pastoral counselors serving low-income areas around Miami. The Bay Mills partnership targeted community college faculty and students and staff working in tribal agencies on the reservation, serving both Native American and non-Native populations. As is evident in these examples, para-professionals and volunteers were targeted for training as a part of the professional strategy. These groups were considered part of the professional team, and the intention was to build their professional capacities.

A key common finding was that education experienced across these sites focused on front-line workers more often than upper level administrators within the systems they were trying to impact. For example, in Tennessee, approximately 600 front-line workers over the past year participated in in-service education offered by the TRC, compared to a combined total of 30 administrators and mid-managers. A similar ratio was evident in Miami. Of all the participants in their in-service training modules, 77 were front-line workers and three were administrators or executive directors.

In order to impact the system effectively, many sites saw a need to impact more than front-line workers. Front-line workers educated in the new paradigm, community-based practices, and more efficient methods of service delivery needed the support of top administrators to create an environment conducive to change. Yet, partnerships found it very difficult to involve them in educational experiences around the new model of working with communities.

The professional strategy created a challenge for front-line workers to sustain their learning and new perspectives and to act as change agents in the face of the rigid system in which they are working. Staff interviewed in one agency said that despite their new learning around building community systems, little in their work policies or procedures reinforced this learning. The staff agreed they needed more training, opportunities to discuss the asset model at staff meetings, and features integrated into their agency procedures.

CoPER has long recognized the need for understanding on the part of both teachers (the equivalent of front-line workers in human services agencies) and administrators. They have several mechanisms in place to encourage learning by all levels of educators about simultaneous renewal and the basic values of their approach.

The Community Strategy

Community residents were the primary target audience for the two sites (New Mexico/Berkeley and Kalamazoo) aligned with the community strategy. Community education was given high priority. In-service education focused on residents with leadership or volunteer roles within the community; it was viewed as another community capacity-building opportunity rather than as the development of an agency. For example, the Berkeley/New Mexico partnership focused on expanding the capacity of the community with little attention to the development of agency staff. Kalamazoo, on the other hand, saw community education as a way for residents to solve their own problems and to augment their access to services available through the human services system. This perspective included the involvement of some agency workers in resident-driven models of service. One goal of the Community Training Associations (CTAs) in Kalamazoo was

to provide agency staff with in-service workshops, seminars, and courses produced by residents. It was a major challenge for community residents, with the help of university faculty, to develop workshops with the quality and focus to be accepted by agency staff. Many political issues had to be addressed to accomplish this goal. The strategy moved forward as community residents involved in the work were elected to public office, giving their work new status.

The Community-Professional Collaboration Strategy

The four sites aligned with the community-professional collaboration strategy concurrently, and often interactively, targeted residents, agency staff/professionals, and university faculty members for educational experiences. The goal was to avoid parallel tracks that keep residents and professionals on opposite sides. Instead the focus was on coalition-building, enabling all groups to exert pressure on the social service system simultaneously—both externally and internally. In order to do this, professionals working within the system worked with residents to design a common language and orientation that allowed them to communicate effectively across domains.

Data Gathering

Another involvement factor that varied among the three strategies was how information was gathered from community residents. Although all four professional strategy sites in the CUP initiative used community residents in some capacity to gather information, data-gathering was primarily through indirect methods. Miami was the exception. They included residents on their training development committee, along with agency and university representatives. The three others relied heavily on focus groups and surveys for community input. In all of the cases, the professionals maintained the decision-making role about how resident input was used. The partnership governance had few, if any, community residents involved. The data gathered from residents was interpreted and used at the discretion of the partnership leaders.

In the community and community-professional strategies, community members were directly involved in the data gathering and interpretation. Sometimes residents involved in the governance of the partnership served as the sources of information and in other cases interested residents learned to do neighborhood surveys and to be actively involved in the interpretation of the data.

Partnerships' Education Content

The content of what was taught through the educational experiences also varied depending on the strategy.

The Professional Strategy

Three of the four partnerships using the professional strategy focused on professional efficacy and efficiency. Their content focused on helping agencies upgrade the skills of those professionals working in a human service capacity. A particularly important point about their educational focus was that the skills were not necessarily associated with features of the asset model nor the new paradigm promoted by the Foundation. That is, the topics of efficacy and efficiency could easily have been the focus of training under a deficit model; they were generically useful skills.

For example, the content of the training from the TRC in Tennessee was linked directly to the requirements for child care center accreditation. The TRC gathered community input on the content for in-services from client polls, special requests, and post-workshop evaluation forms. Content covered: early childhood curriculum development, child development, "red flag" behaviors, and professional, legal, and legislative updates. In Chicago, the content of training was closely tied to core competencies for youth workers developed by the partnership. Workshop topics included risk management, group dynamics, time management, and stress management.

It appeared that these sites were focused much more on a basic level of professional skill that was absent among their workers than on the key aspects of the asset model. They either did not understand (or value) the significance or nature of the asset model that addressed a different way of viewing the community or saw the other skills as essential building blocks before addressing these new features.

The other partnership using the professional strategy did focus on the development of new mental models around the new paradigm. (A mental model is a deeply ingrained assumption or generalization that influences how people understand the world and how they behave in their environment.) The content oriented professionals to any or all of three areas associated with the new paradigm: interagency collaboration, community-based practices, and cultural competence. Miami created four modules—Cultural Diversity and Awareness, Building Community/Mobilization, Substance Abuse and Prevention, and Attachments as in Bonding—infused with asset model features and community perspectives. The focus was on better planning and delivery of services through understanding and application of information about community perspectives.

This struggle to focus on the issues of community assets using the professional strategy may be comparable to CoPER attempting to address equity issues without the involvement of the community.

The Community Strategy

The asset model factors were prominent in the content of the community strategy because the strategy itself highlighted the strengths and values of the community rather than its deficits. For example, the CTAs in the four Kalamazoo neighborhoods selected topics related to current issues that residents felt needed to be addressed in the community in order to improve circumstances for families living there. The topics included at-risk youth, youth as community assets, effective community communication, creating neighborhood watches, minority foster care, community ownership for problem-solving, and creating a neighborhood bartering system. They approached these topics from an asset perspective.

The Berkeley/New Mexico site focused the content of capacity building heavily on language preservation among Native Americans. Community members identified language as a critical issue in the pueblos since it is part of the social structure and value of the community. The inability of intergenerational groups to converse in their native language signaled to them the unraveling of their cultural and social structure. For this partnership, reestablishing the essence of their culture meant preserving, and in some cases, reintroducing, the native language. Their work was closely linked to bringing about change in the schools.

All in all, content within the community strategy focused on recognizing and expanding the strengths of individual residents as well as maximizing the collective efforts of community members. It focused on surfacing the authenticity and voice of the community within the context of their cultural and social realities.

The content was focused on three distinct strands:

1. Information and skills related to solving real community problems from the community's cultural and social perspectives
2. Information and skills related to community development, organization, and advocacy
3. Information and skills related to generic life skills (e.g., parenting, literacy, nutrition, and computer skills)

The Community-Professional Collaboration Strategy

The content of educational experiences within this strategy focused on building capacities in residents (as in the community strategy) as well as helping professionals understand their role in the life of the community (as in some sites using the professional strategy). Education at the professional level focused on getting professionals to understand the community as the basic context for enabling people to contribute their gifts and to be problem-solvers in their own lives and communities. They helped professionals play a supportive rather than domineering role in the life of families. Consequently, the content included asset model features, community-based practices, community-development principles, and community-organizing strategies as opposed to the more generic professional skills seen in some sites using the professional strategy. Content was organized around solving real-life problems that drew on both professional and community people.

Community development (renewal) was a strong focus within this strategy for both in-service and community education. Systems thinking was heavily emphasized for all participants. One university partner stated that "the danger in an exclusive focus on services is that you are really focusing on problems and helping people ameliorate conditions. When you're looking at community development, you move in a much more proactive kind of process. There are three levels. You've got the amelioration or addressing of problems; you've got prevention, which is a step up from that, and then you've got building and producing things. You need all three. For real change you have to get to the production level."

In some sites the strategy focused on generic life skills for residents. For example, in Long Beach an Hispanic resident who was involved in the Juvenile Crime Prevention Program's (JCPP) community oversight committee said having training in English as a Second Language allowed her to participate more confidently and more fully in the governance of the committee and the JCPP.

Residents wanted to solve immediate problems negatively impacting their lives either at a personal level or a community level. Sites using this strategy balanced the focus on immediate problems in communities with building the capacity for residents to be proactive in guiding their communal and personal lives.

Questions for School-University Partnerships

The CoPER data collected through the portraitures indicated that there was a lack of parent and student involvement in shaping the simultaneous renewal agenda. This comparison with the work of the community-university partnerships in other settings suggests at least three ways that CoPER could extend its work to incorporate these perspectives. The three ways vary significantly in the strength of the community voice.

The most radically different approach would be to move to a community strategy. This is likely to be most appropriate within partner school settings where the community feels especially alienated from the schools. It may mean involving a very different segment of the university faculty—social work departments—in bringing this about. For example, social work faculty might work with community residents as well as with university education and arts and science faculty and school faculty to understand the ways that education has become over-professionalized in the eyes of the community. Renewal of the community might be identified as a part of the CoPER simultaneous renewal agenda that now focuses only on the schools and universities/colleges. After 13 years of the professional strategy, is it time to expand the strategy?

Another approach would be to shift to a community-professional collaboration strategy. For example, community residents might be added to the governing board and coordinating committee of CoPER and involved more fully in the governance of specific partner schools. Under this scenario community members might be receiving training along with educators in the summer institutes and other professional development experiences that now occur.

Yet another approach would be to keep the professional strategy but intentionally expand the avenues for community members and students, especially high school students, to have a voice in the work of the partnership and the partner schools.

The CUP findings about the content of the pre-service, in-service, and community education also suggests that the different strategies with their different degrees of community participation could radically change the content of CoPER's work on equity and excellence for all students. Could it be that if a community or community-professional strategy were used the content of what constitutes excellence and equity in education would be much more based on what a community values and what would be the basis of community development and renewal?

These are the kinds of issues that such an analysis raises. Are these important issues for CoPER? Is it appropriate for the evaluation team to raise these issues through analyses such as this? How far should the evaluators go in looking into these matters that question the fundamental assumptions of the endeavor being evaluated, in this case the CoPER?

Appendix A

Examples of Community-University Partnership Work

The community-university partnerships tended to involve a wide variety of activities. The information below provides a flavor of the work undertaken by the partnerships and illustrates the range of partners and orientations.

Bay Mills – Adding Community and Agency Perspectives to Curriculum Reform

The partnership revised the Social Science and Human Service Technology curriculum at Bay Mills Community College (BMCC)—Michigan's only tribally controlled college. Project Director Barbara Ogston and BMCC faculty member Katherine Anderson assembled a community advisory committee that helped guide an eight-member faculty team in developing new core modules for the human service discipline. Anderson ran the committee in keeping with the traditional Native American values of collective decision-making and consensus building. The group followed the Native American concept of the *talking circle* to create an open structure, allowing people to come and go as their time and interest necessitated, while letting each person contribute his/her ideas and suggestions. "We always had open breakfast meetings. People heard about it and decided they wanted to be part of it," remembers Barbara Ogston.

Berkeley/New Mexico – Restoring the Community Fabric through Language Revitalization

The partnership was formed to determine how Indian communities could draw on their traditions and knowledge to improve the well-being of families in six pueblos and two Alaskan native communities. The key partners—six New Mexico Native-American doctoral fellows at the University of California-Berkeley and a Berkeley faculty member—created a strategy to help revitalize the speaking of native languages in the communities represented in the partnership. One pueblo, Cochiti, serves as an example of the process and the impact of language revitalization in a community. During the first year of the partnership, the partners held a series of educational meetings with the people of Cochiti Pueblo. Once consensus was reached about how to proceed, two of the Native American doctoral fellows worked with a University of New Mexico faculty member to structure training programs. They assumed the role of facilitators and identified community members who were native speakers of Keres—the indigenous Cochiti language. The partners trained two key groups of Keres speakers in ways to teach the language to children, teens, and young adults in natural settings and everyday life in the pueblo.

Chelsea/Dudley – Redefining Resident-Driven Models of Service Delivery and Community Education

The four partners—two universities and two communities—created more resident-centered services for families; they educated and empowered residents to solve their own challenges with the support of local agencies; and they pushed for more resident presence in agencies. The partnership emphasized a different aspect within each of the distinct communities. The Chelsea Human Services Collaborative (CHSC) focused its efforts on maximizing the power of the residents through community organizing. It developed the Community Connections project with federal Family Preservation funds to involve local residents in program design, implementation,

and community improvement. In the Dudley neighborhood, residents worked toward playing a more active role in the agencies operating within their community. The Dudley Families and Neighbors felt strongly about holding agencies more accountable to the people, so they educated residents about their rights and empowered them to operate as informed participants.

Chicago – Developing Professional Youth Workers

The Chicago Youth Agency Partnership (CYAP) was initiated by three long-standing youth-serving agencies with neighborhood branches throughout the city. They came together to address the training and education needed to create professional youth workers. The partnership carried out three primary strategies to upgrade the professional standards of youth workers: they offered training to upgrade their skills; they devised a process that would give credentials and certify the skills of youth workers; and they created an academic ladder. They started by drafting twelve characteristics and capacities desired in youth development workers with input from young people. According to Bill Conrad, the initial project director, the partnership then conducted an environmental scan of the Chicago area to identify what training was available throughout the 90 plus member agencies. The challenge, according to Ayani Good, training coordinator, was to develop the capacity to meet the immediate need many agencies had for training. They coordinated training events among the member agencies, and they developed new training courses to fill gaps in the current offerings. Finally, they developed an academic ladder through Aurora University and Spertus College.

Cleveland – Building on the Work of Previous Partnerships

Eight agency partners came together to form the Human Resources Development Initiative. This partnership linked together several key Cleveland initiatives. The partnership changed its name to the Cleveland Family Development Collaborative (CFDC) to reflect its family development focus. The partnership faithfully gathered community input through community focus groups and surveys, and they used this information in training. In the second year, however, they decided that in order to be true to their principles, they needed direct community representation in the partnership. They asked the East Village Council to join them as a partner. Residents and practitioners wanted to see a stronger academic career ladder. The two original partner institutions of higher education, Cleveland State University and Case Western Reserve, were joined by the local community college, Cleveland Community College (Tri-C). Together, these institutions created a social work career ladder beginning with the associates level at Tri-C and following through to the graduate level at Case Western Reserve University.

Kalamazoo – Rebuilding Trust Between Communities and Universities

The partnership rebuilt trust between the community and the university by establishing a relationship between the School of Social Work at Western Michigan University and four neighborhoods in Kalamazoo. They did this by creating a partnership that allowed community representatives to sit at the table with the university as equal partners. The steering committee was composed of four community representatives, one from each neighborhood association, and four faculty members from the School of Social Work. The partners began rebuilding trust by helping each neighborhood create a Community Training Association (CTA). These associations provided a structure for community residents to design, develop, and deliver community oriented topics as in-service education to local agencies and community residents. They also provided a

structure within which university faculty, students, residents, and agency staff could come together. All four CTAs were composed of a six- to ten-member team located in the neighborhood. They were autonomous, but each one was responsible for developing at least one training module in the first year of the project and three additional training modules in the second year.

Long Beach – Strengthening Collaboration Through Joint Training

The Long Beach Interdisciplinary Training Partnership (ITP) was formed to bring residents and agency personnel together within the extremely diverse neighborhood identified by zip code 90813. Racial and language barriers, along with negative cultural stereotypes, were challenges that the trainers of the ITP sought to address through capacity building. The university-based ITP staff spent the first year offering residents training and capacity building opportunities to develop their natural leadership skills. They also educated staff members from 16 agencies and schools involved with the Juvenile Crime Prevention Program (JCPP) about community-based practices. Agency representatives learned about the issues personally effecting the families they served. Residents acquired professional skills in advocacy, decision-making, and collaboration. Julie O'Donnell, project co-director, saw an increase in the ability of residents to advocate for themselves. Some of the most effective collaboration capacity building grew out of joint participation in community activities such as the community photo project, "A Day in the Life of 90813."

Miami – Teaching New Perspectives

This partnership dared to bring together some non-traditional agencies. Original partners included four academic institutions, two religious-based community agencies, and one legal agency. The partnership revised the content of three general courses in psychology, sociology, and social work. Faculty members piloted a team approach to the course revision process by involving academicians, agency practitioners, recipients of services or training, and students. Team members worked side-by-side in some twelve meetings over more than one year to develop content and strategies to revise these courses. The old psychology and sociology courses lacked cultural diversity and a spiritual perspective. The team restructured the courses to focus on cultural relevance, cross-cultural problems with different families, religion, and social problems related to culture and ethnicity. The professors teaching the revised courses saw a tremendous impact on their students. Most of these courses focus on interactive exercises that involve live lecture, video, and role playing. The courses have been particularly important in increasing students' understanding of diversity issues, a main focus of the partnership.

Pittsburgh – Families and Youth 2000, Building on the Power of Relationships

This partnership formed around a mission of social change rooted in a spiritual base. Putting the spiritual life of families and neighborhoods first was, and continues to be, central to the partners' holistic approach to healthy families. The partnership is built on the tradition set by Black churches that have long served families socially, economically, and politically as well as spiritually. The partners see the African-American church always at the center of major social changes and movements. Project co-director Barbara Rogers said the partnership focused on the Black church because it is the one institution that can service the entire family, including the extended family, from the cradle to the grave. The partners developed a training plan for the four

churches in the collaborative and gained a reputation as a model of community-based service delivery in African-American communities. They created new "linkages" with local hospitals and social service agencies. Most importantly, the partnership improved the well-being of families. Doug Ronsheim, project co-director, said the key to their success has been adhering to the basic principles of relationship building.

Tennessee – Empowering Rural Child Care Providers

Originally established to make social services for children and families more coordinated and to help agencies collaborate more effectively, the Tennessee partnership had the courage to change course in response to community input. The project staff held community forums and focus groups with local families, particularly single mothers receiving social services in the 14-county area. To the surprise of the project staff, families said their primary concern wasn't service delivery, but child care issues. The partnership ended up helping local child care providers upgrade their skills. They made training accessible by taking the training to the care providers and offering it at convenient times on evenings and weekends. The training helped child care providers to understand child development, to stimulate children's minds and bodies with simple everyday experiences and materials, and to promote early childhood education, particularly literacy. A part of the partner's training strategy was to develop a "train the trainer" component. Staff also set up a program to shepherd child care centers through the arduous process of accreditation. As a result of the partnership's focus on child care, other organizations and coalitions in the region have begun to address family and children's issues.